

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

RETISH VIKASH SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

B. SCOTT, et al.,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05547-BHS-BAT

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
USE A PSEUDONYM, DKT. 9**

Before the Court is Petitioner's sealed motion to use a pseudonym. Dkt 9. The matter was initiated on July 5, 2024 when Petitioner submitted a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition, contending he has been in immigration custody since 2023, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1226, and "is not statutorily eligible for an individualized determination as to whether he should be released on bond." Dkt. 9 at 10. Plaintiff contends the Court should grant § 2241 relief by ordering his release or directing he be provided a bond hearing because his detention violates his right to due process, and because the immigration detention center exposes him to COVID-19, other diseases, and is an unclean and unhealthful facility.

On July 24, 2024, Petitioner filed a sealed motion to use a pseudonym, claiming the use of his name may expose him to risks in the immigration detention facility. Dkt. 9. A party is presumptively required to use their real name and may use a pseudonym only in the unusual

1 case. *See Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.* (“Advanced Textile Corp.”), 214 F.3d  
2 1058, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2000). Courts have permitted a party to use a pseudonym when: (1)  
3 identification creates a risk of retaliatory harm; (2) it is needed to preserve privacy in highly  
4 sensitive matters; or (3) the party is compelled to admit the intent to commit illegal acts and risks  
5 criminal prosecution. *Id.*

6 None of these considerations apply here. In his motion, Petitioner requests use of a  
7 pseudonym because of allegations he has presented to the detention facility. Plaintiff’s  
8 allegations are known to Respondent and those in the detention facility because Respondent  
9 addressed the allegations and found them to be unfounded, according to Plaintiff. The use of a  
10 pseudonym thus provides no protection to Petitioner as to his fears of possible retaliation. A  
11 pseudonym also provides no privacy protection because Petitioner’s allegations are already  
12 known. And lastly, nothing in Petitioner’s motion involves the possible danger of self-  
13 incrimination and criminal charges.

14 The Court accordingly ORDERS:

- 15 1. The motion to use a pseudonym, Dkt. 9, is DENIED.
- 16 2. The clerk shall provide Petitioner a copy of this Order.

17 DATED this 7<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024.

18  
19   
20 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
21 United States Magistrate Judge  
22  
23